

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claim 29 has been amended to clarify that "each of the bit groups includes a plurality of bits." No new matter has been added.

Pending Claims

The Office Actions dated November 3, 2005 and November 28, 2005 each identify claims 1-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53, 54 and 56-60 as pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that, due to non-prejudicial claim cancellation in prior-filed amendments, the pending claims are in fact, 1-4, 6, 7, 9-15, 17-19, 21-30, 32-39, 41-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53, 54 and 56-60. Confirmation of same is respectfully requested.

Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview

In a November 14, 2006 telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned representative of applicant, an objection to claim 1 and distinctions between selected application claims and the subject matter disclosed in U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0032775A1 of Srinivasan et al. ("Srinivasan") were discussed.

With regard to claim 1, applicant pointed out that claim 1 was amended in an Amendment dated August 11, 2005 to correct an informality and requested that the objection be withdrawn. The Examiner agreed that claim 1 was amended and communicated same in the November 28, 2005 Office Action. Although not explicitly stated in the November 28, 2005 Office Action, applicant understands the objection to claim 1 to be withdrawn.

Applicant further pointed out that Srinivasan does not disclose "selecting the first translation information in a first cycle and the second translation information in a second cycle." No agreement was reached and the Examiner communicated in the November 28, 2005 Office Action that the rejection set forth in the November 3, 2005 Office Action is maintained. This ground of rejection is addressed below.

With regard to claim 14, applicant pointed out that Srinivasan does not disclose "decode circuitry coupled to the storage element to decode the translation information." The Examiner agreed and communicated in the November 28, 2005 Office Action that applicant's position regarding claim 14 is persuasive. Accordingly, applicant understands the section 102 rejection of claim 14 and dependent claims 19, 22-25, 27 and 28 to be withdrawn and requests

confirmation of same.

With respect to claims 15, 17, 18, 26, 32, 34-35, 42 and 56-60, which have been rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in combination with various references, applicant pointed out that the Declaration of Common Ownership (the "Declaration") filed together with an August 11, 2005 Amendment was believed to overcome such 103 rejections, but that the Declaration was not mentioned in the November 3, 2005 Office Action. The Examiner acknowledged receipt of the Declaration in the November 28, 2005 Office Action, but did not indicate that the section 103 rejections have been withdrawn. Applicant submits that the Declaration is sufficient to overcome the section 103 rejections for the reasons set forth in the August 11, 2005 Amendment and respectfully requests confirmation of same.

Claim Rejections -- Double Patenting

Claim 14 has been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6, 13 and 17 of co-pending application no. 10/077,829. Applicant notes that claim 17 of application 10/077,829 does not depend from or otherwise include the limitation of claim 13 as the analysis set forth in the November 3, 2005 Office Action appears to imply. Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the omission of the limitation of claim 13 within claim 17, a prima-facie case of obviousness is not established by claim 17 of application 10/077,829 and therefore respectfully requests that the obviousness-type double-patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, 19, 22-25, 27-30, 33, 37-39, 41, 43, 45-47, 49-51, 53 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Srinivasan.

Applicant respectfully submits that each of such claims recites one or more limitations not disclosed by Srinivasan. For example, claim 1 recites, in part:

translating, in response to first translation information, the first bit group
from the first position to a different position in a comparand;
translating the second bit group from the second position to a second
position of the comparand in response to second translation
information;
selecting the first translation information in a first cycle and the second
translation information in a second cycle;

Srinivasan discloses that the filtering of an input string may be accomplished sequentially (Srinivasan, paragraph 58) and discloses various embodiments for bit-by-bit programming of a filter circuit (Srinivasan, generally at paragraph 71 and more specifically at paragraphs 78-101), **but Srinivasan does not specifically disclose “selecting the first translation information in a first cycle and the second translation information in a second cycle” as recited in claim 1, and no such disclosure has been pointed out in either the November 3, 2005 Office Action, nor the November 28, 2005 Office Action.** Applicant respectfully submits that Srinivasan lacks the above-recited limitation and therefore does not anticipate claim 1, nor claims 2-4, 6-7 or 9-13 which depend from claim 1.

Regarding claim 14, as noted above in the Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview, applicant understands the section 102 rejection of claim 14 and dependent claims 19, 22-25, 27 and 28 to be withdrawn and requests confirmation of same.

Claim 29 recites, in part:

wherein each of the plurality of translation circuitry is configured to
translate each of the plurality of bit groups in a respective operation cycle

As discussed above, Srinivasan discloses that the filtering of an input string may be accomplished sequentially (Srinivasan, paragraph 58) and discloses various embodiments for bit-by-bit programming of a filter circuit (Srinivasan, generally at paragraph 71 and more specifically at paragraphs 78-101), **but Srinivasan does not specifically disclose translating each of a plurality of bit groups (each bit group recited as including a plurality of bits) in a respective operation cycle.** Therefore, Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 29, nor dependent claims 30, 33 and 36-38.

Claim 39 recites, in part:

decode circuitry coupled to the storage element to decode the translation
information and to establish a switch circuit connection in the switch
circuit between the first position and the position in the comparand

As discussed in the August 11, 2005 Amendment in connection with claim 14, Srinivasan discloses a decoder 1304 for decoding the output of an address counter 1302 (Srinivasan, paragraph 79, referring to Figure 12), but does not disclose decode circuitry to decode the translation information. Thus, for at least the reasons given previously with respect to claim 14, which applicant understands to be in condition for allowance, Srinivasan does not anticipate

claim 39 nor dependent claim 41.

Claim 43 recites, in part:

means for decoding the translation information

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons given above in reference to claim 39, Srinivasan does not disclose means for decoding the translation information and therefore that Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 43 nor dependent claim 45.

Claim 46 recites, in part:

a decode circuitry coupled to the storage element to decode the translation information and to establish a switch circuit connection between the first position and the position in the comparand

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons given above in reference to claim 39, Srinivasan does not disclose the above-recited limitation and therefore that Srinivasan does not anticipate claim 46 nor dependent claim 47.

Claim 49 recites, in part:

means for translating, in response to first translation information, the first bit group from the first position to a different position in a comparand;

means for comparing the comparand with data stored in a CAM array;
means for translating the second bit group from the second position to a second position of the comparand in response to second translation information; and

means for selecting the first translation information in a first cycle and the second translation information in a second cycle

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons given above in reference to claim 1, Srinivasan does not disclose the above-recited combination and therefore does not anticipate claim 49 nor dependent claims 50, 51, 53 and 54.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15, 17, 18, 26, 32, 34-35, 42 and 56-60, have been rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan in combination with various references. As noted above in the Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview, applicant submits that the 103 rejections have

been overcome by the Declaration of Common Ownership filed with the August 11, 2005 Amendment and respectfully requests confirmation of same.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 21 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claim 21 if so amended, but respectfully declines to amend claim 21 at this time in view of the foregoing remarks.

Reason for Rejection of Claim 36 Not Provided

Claim 36 is identified in the Office Action summary as rejected, but no reason for rejection is provided. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36, which depends from claim 29 is in condition for allowance.

In Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

A petition for a three (3) month extension of time is enclosed herewith.

Authorization is hereby given to charge deposit account 501914 for any fee deficiency associated with this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL GREGORY & COURTNEY LLP

Date May 3, 2006


Charles E. Shemwell, Reg. No. 40,171
Tel. 408-236-6645